

1 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP

Charles K. Verhoeven (Bar No. 170151)

2 charlesverhoeven@quinnemanuel.com

David A. Perlson (Bar No. 209502)

3 davidperlson@quinnemanuel.com

Melissa Baily (Bar No. 237649)

4 melissabaily@quinnemanuel.com

John Neukom (Bar No. 275887)

5 johnneukom@quinnemanuel.com

Jordan Jaffe (Bar No. 254886)

6 jordanjaffe@quinnemanuel.com

50 California Street, 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor

7 San Francisco, California 94111-4788

Telephone: (415) 875-6600

8 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

9 Attorneys for WAYMO LLC

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

12 WAYMO LLC,

13 Plaintiff,

14 vs.

15 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.;  
16 OTTOMOTTO LLC; OTTO TRUCKING  
17 LLC,

18 Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:17-cv-00939-WHA

**DECLARATION OF ANDREA PALLIOS  
ROBERTS**

1 I, Andrea Pallios Roberts, hereby declare as follows.

2 1. I am a member of the bar of the State of California and an attorney with Quinn  
3 Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP, counsel for Plaintiff Waymo LLC ("Waymo"). I make this  
4 declaration of personal, firsthand knowledge, and if called and sworn as a witness, I could and  
5 would testify competently as follows.

6 2. In mid-July, during a meet and confer with Special Master Cooper, the parties  
7 discussed a procedure by which they would serve Rule 30(b)(6) deposition notices. Among the  
8 issues discussed was whether it would be appropriate for Waymo to serve a separate 30(b)(6)  
9 notice on Uber and Ottomotto. Counsel for Uber and Ottomotto took the position that Waymo  
10 was only entitled to serve a single 30(b)(6) notice on Uber and Ottomotto because Ottomotto is  
11 now part of Uber and its employees are Uber employees. Waymo's explained that for some of the  
12 topics, such as topics relating to Uber's acquisition of Ottomotto, the testimony may be different  
13 because the two were on opposite sides of the transaction. Ultimately, Waymo agreed to serve a  
14 single 30(b)(6) notice on Uber and Ottomotto and said it would identify those topics on which  
15 testimony may be different for Uber and Ottomotto. Waymo served its single 30(b)(6) notice on  
16 Uber and Ottomotto on July 20.

17 3. On August 2, 2017, during a meet and confer with Special Master Cooper, the  
18 parties discussed the application of Rule 30(a) to Uber and Ottomotto. The Special Master  
19 confirmed that when the parties discussed limits on interrogatories, he had not considered that  
20 Uber and Otto might be treated as separate parties for purposes of discovery.

21 4. Attached as Exhibit 1 is a true and correct copy of excerpts from the April 19, 2017  
22 deposition of Lior Ron.

23 5. Attached as Exhibit 2 is a true and correct copy of excerpts from the June 22, 2017  
24 deposition of Ningjun Qi.

25 6. Attached as Exhibit 3 is a true and correct copy of excerpts from the June 19, 2017  
26 deposition of Cameron Poetzsch.

27 7. Attached as Exhibit 4 is a true and correct copy of Defendant Uber Technologies,  
28 Inc.'s First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1-11), served May 17, 2017.

1           8.       Attached as Exhibit 5 is a true and correct copy of Defendant Uber Technologies,  
2 Inc. and Ottomotto LLC's Responses to Waymo's First Set of Common Interrogatories (No. 1-3),  
3 served July 28, 2017.

4           9.       Attached as Exhibit 6 is a true and correct copy of Defendant Uber Technologies,  
5 Inc. and Ottomotto LLC's Third Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 13-14), served June 15, 2017.

6           10.      Attached as Exhibit 7 is a true and correct copy of an email I sent on June 7, 2017.

7           11.      Attached as Exhibit 8 is a true and correct copy of an email I sent on June 21, 2017.

8           I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the  
9 foregoing is true and correct.

10          DATED: August 9, 2017

11                               /s/ Andrea Pallios Roberts  
Andrea Pallios Roberts

12  
13                               **SIGNATURE ATTESTATION**

14           Pursuant to Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), I attest under penalty of perjury that concurrence in the  
15 filing of this document has been obtained from Andrea Pallios Roberts.

16  
17                               /s/ Charles K. Verhoeven  
Charles K. Verhoeven